

REMARKS

Upon entry of the foregoing Amendment, claims 1-18 are pending in the application. Claims 1-5, 9-10, 13, and 15 have been amended. No claims have been cancelled or newly added. Applicants believe that this Amendment does not add new matter. In view of the foregoing Amendment and the following Remarks, allowance of all the pending claims is requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

A. CLAIMS 1-3, 5-7, 9, 11, 13, AND 15-18

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-3, 5-7, 9, 11, 13, and 15-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 7,069,310 to Bartholomew ("Bartholomew") in view of U.S. Patent 7,263,655 to Carden, Jr. ("Carden"). This rejection is improper and should be withdrawn for at least the reason that the references relied upon, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose, teach, or suggest each and every feature of the claimed invention.

More particularly, Bartholomew and Carden, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose, teach, or suggest at least the feature of a "remote content review/control site allowing a reviewing authority that operates the remote content review/control site to view a real-time stream of each multimedia work in the catalog and edit the abstract record relating to each multimedia work in the catalog," as recited in independent claim 1, for example. The Examiner has acknowledged that "Bartholomew does not disclose a remote content review/control site as claimed." However, the Examiner alleges that Carden discloses a system for reviewing, editing, and publishing uploaded multimedia documents, further alleging that the system described in Carden allows a reviewing authority to edit a document that includes an abstract.

Applicants disagree with the Examiner's assessment for at least the reason that, assuming *arguendo* that that the descriptive information in Bartholomew can be considered similar to the claimed "abstract record," the Examiner takes an inconsistent position in alleging that Carden allows reviewers to "edit the document . . . which includes an abstract." In

particular, Carden indicates that the “abstract” that reviewers can ostensibly edit would be part of the document itself, such as a brief summary commonly included as part of a manuscript submitted for publication in a journal. In this context, the “abstract” described in column 12 of Carden would therefore fail to read on the claim language, which recites the “abstract record” distinctly from the multimedia work itself.

For example, the “abstract record” is recited in the claims as including one or more data fields relating to the multimedia work (i.e., the data fields in the abstract record describe characteristics of the multimedia work, such as a category, subject, date, runtime, or other characteristic, as shown in Applicants’ Figure 4). Furthermore, the claimed invention recites that the “abstract record” is stored separately from the work, rather than being part of the work itself. Referring to independent claim 1, for example, an administrator site is recited as separately “storing the multimedia works the library, and further storing the abstract records relating to the multimedia works in the library.”

On the other hand, if the descriptive information in Bartholomew were to control the Examiner’s interpretation of an “abstract,” Carden does not provide reviewers with the ability to edit information that describes the work. Rather, Carden at best allows reviewers to edit aspects of the manuscript itself, wherein any editing of the abstract would amount to editing of the manuscript. In contrast, the claimed invention recites “the remote content review/control site allowing a reviewing authority that operates the remote content review/control site to view a real-time stream of each multimedia work in the catalog and edit the abstract record relating to each multimedia work in the catalog.” That is, although the claimed “abstract record” does relate to the multimedia works, the abstract record is nonetheless distinct from the work itself.

Accordingly, for at least the foregoing reasons, neither Bartholomew nor Carden, either alone or in combination, discloses, teaches, or suggests a “remote content review/control site allowing a reviewing authority that operates the remote content review/control site to view a real-time stream of each multimedia work in the catalog and edit the abstract record relating to each multimedia work in the catalog,” as recited in independent claim 1, for example. The rejection is therefore improper and should be withdrawn.

Furthermore, in addition to the distinctions identified above, Bartholomew and Carden, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose, teach, or suggest that “the remote content review/control site sends a publication approval message to the administrator site to indicate when the reviewing authority approves one or more of the multimedia works in the catalog for public access,” with “the administration site making the approved multimedia works available for public access in response to receiving the publication approval message from the remote content review/control site,” as recited in independent claim 1, for example. The Examiner alleges that Carden discloses a reviewer writing a publication recommendation email which is forwarded to a board of editors for a final decision before publication, alleging that the publication recommendation email is the equivalent of the claimed “publication approval message.”

Applicants disagree with the Examiner’s assessment because Carden indicates that approval messages are sent to the author of the work, rather than an administrator site where the author originally submitted the work. For example, Carden indicates that an editor in chief is presented with a question of whether to accept a manuscript, and when the manuscript is accepted, a “Comments to Author Form (for acceptance)” is completed and sent to the author (e.g., column 18, lines 45-61). Thus, in Carden, when a manuscript is approved for publication, an approval email is sent to the author of the work. However, Carden does not disclose, teach, or suggest that the approval email is sent “to the administrator site to indicate when the reviewing authority approves one or more of the multimedia works in the catalog for public access.”

As a result, because Carden does not describe a review process where approval messages are sent to a site where “one or more users have submitted [multimedia works] for public access distribution,” Carden necessarily fails to disclose, teach, or suggest “the administration site making the approved multimedia works available for public access in response to receiving the publication approval message from the remote content review/control site.” Carden merely describes a process by which an approval or rejection letter is prepared and sent to an author of a manuscript, without disclosing, teaching, or suggesting that approval messages are also sent to a site that makes the approved manuscripts

“available for public access in response to receiving the publication approval message,” as recited in independent claim 1, for example.

Accordingly, for at least the foregoing reasons, Bartholomew and Carden, either alone or in combination, further fail to disclose, teach, or suggest that “the remote content review/control site sends a publication approval message to the administrator site to indicate when the reviewing authority approves one or more of the multimedia works in the catalog for public access,” with “the administration site making the approved multimedia works available for public access in response to receiving the publication approval message from the remote content review/control site,” as recited in independent claim 1, for example. The rejection is therefore improper and should be withdrawn.

Independent claims 5 and 9 include features similar to those set forth in independent claim 1. Dependent claims 2-3, 5-7, 9, 11, 13, and 15-18 depend from and add features to one of independent claims 1, 5, and 9. Thus, the rejection of these claims is likewise improper and should be withdrawn for at least the same reasons.

B. CLAIMS 4, 8, 10, 12, AND 14

The Examiner has rejected claims 4, 8, 10, 12, and 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as allegedly being unpatentable. In particular, the Examiner has rejected claims 4, 8, and 14 over Bartholomew in view of Carden and U.S. Patent No. 7,159,233 to Son et al. (“Son”), and claims 10 and 12 over Bartholomew in view of Carden and Patent No. 7,308,413 to Tota et al. (“Tota”). These rejections are improper and should be withdrawn for at least the reason that the references relied upon, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose, teach, or suggest each and every feature of the claimed invention.

More particularly, for at least the reasons discussed above, Bartholomew and Carden, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose, teach, or suggest at least the feature of a “remote content review/control site allowing a reviewing authority that operates the remote content review/control site to view a real-time stream of each multimedia work in the catalog and edit the abstract record relating to each multimedia work in the catalog,” as recited in

independent claim 1, for example. Son and Tota each fail to cure at least this deficiency of the combination of Bartholomew and Carden.

In addition, for at least the further reasons discussed above, Bartholomew and Carden, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose, teach, or suggest that “the remote content review/control site sends a publication approval message to the administrator site to indicate when the reviewing authority approves one or more of the multimedia works in the catalog for public access,” with “the administration site making the approved multimedia works available for public access in response to receiving the publication approval message from the remote content review/control site,” as recited in independent claim 1, for example. Son and Tota each also fail to cure at least this further deficiency of the combination of Bartholomew and Carden.

Accordingly, for at least the foregoing reasons, the references relied upon, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose, teach, or suggest each and every feature of independent claim 1. Independent claims 5 and 9 includes features similar to those set forth in independent claim 1. Dependent claims 4, 8, 10, 12, and 14 depend from and add features to one of independent claims 1, 5, and 9. Thus, the rejections of these claim are improper and should be withdrawn for at least the foregoing reasons.

CONCLUSION

Having addressed each of the foregoing rejections, it is respectfully submitted that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action. As such, the application is in condition for allowance. Notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Date: October 31, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By:



Sued Jafar Ali

Registration No. 58,780

PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN LLP
P.O. Box 10500
McLean, Virginia 22102
Main: 703-770-7900
Direct: 703-770-7540
Fax: 703-770-7901